REGULAR MEETING of the
San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)
Thursday, October 17, 2019

Martin Luther King Community Center
725 Monte Diablo Avenue, Conference Room
City of San Mateo, CA 94401
7:00 p.m.

If you wish to speak to the Committee, please fill out a speaker's slip located on the tables as you enter the meeting room. If you have anything that you wish to be distributed to the Committee and included in the official record, please hand it to a member of SMCBPAC staff who will distribute the information to the Committee members and other staff.

1. WELCOME

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

This item is reserved for persons wishing to address the Committee on any SMCBPAC-related matters that are as follows: 1) Not otherwise on this meeting agenda; 2) Staff Report on the Regular Agenda; or 3) Committee Members’ Reports on the Regular Agenda. Public comments on matters not listed above shall be heard at the time the matter is called.

As with all public comment, members of the public who wish to address the Committee are requested to complete a speaker's slip and provide it to SMCBPAC staff. Speakers are customarily limited to two minutes, but an extension can be provided to you at the discretion of the Committee Chair.

4. ACTION TO SET AGENDA

This item is to set the final regular agenda.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Review and Approve September 25, 2019 Meeting Minutes (Action)
6. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion (Information)

7. Presentation on Crystal Springs Dam Bike Lanes and Traffic Signage (Information)

8. Follow up Discussion on Crystal Springs Regional Trail (Information)

9. Discussion of BPAC 2020 Work Plan (Information)

10. County Updates (Information)

11. Adjournment

Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Committee meeting are available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members of the Committee. The Office of Sustainability, located at 455 County Center, 4th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, has been designated for the purpose of making those public records available for inspection. The documents are also available on the SMCBPAC’s website. The website is located at: http://www.smcsustainability.org/livable-communities/active-transportation/.

Meetings are accessible to people with disabilities. Individuals who need special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact Julia Malmo-Laycock, Sustainability Specialist, at least two working days before the meeting at (650) 363-4685 and/or jmalmolaycock@smcgov.org. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the SMCBPAC to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting and the materials related to it. Attendees to this meeting are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products.
San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)

MEETING MINUTES
Millbrae Community Center Classroom
Millbrae, California
Wednesday, September 25, 2019
7:00pm

1. WELCOME

Chair Gore called the meeting to order at 7:01pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dianna Butcher, Natalie Gore, Elaine Salinger (alternate), William Kelly, Susan Doherty

Members Absent: John Langbein (alternate)

County Staff: Danielle Lee, Matthew Petrofsky, Julia Malmo-Laycock, Paul Sheng

Julia Malmo-Laycock conducted the roll call. A quorum was present.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

No public comments were received.

4. ACTION TO SET AGENDA

Chair Gore requested a motion to set the agenda.

Motion: Alternate Vice Chair Kelly moved to approve/ Member Doherty seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Review and Approve August 15, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Chair Gore requested a motion to adopt the August 15, 2019 Meeting Minutes.
Motion: Vice Chair Kelly moved to approve/Alternate Member Salinger seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

6. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion

Vice Chair Kelly indicated he would be meeting with Jen Wolosin of Parents for Safe Routes the following day, and will likely make a suggestion for a future agenda item following this meeting.

7. Presentation on Summary of Crystal Springs Regional Trail Grand Jury Report Findings (Information)

Paul Sheng of San Mateo County, County Council delivered a presentation on the history of Civil Grand Juries and what a Civil Grand Jury is today, including its roles, juror selection, and actions the grand jury takes as well as limitations. Each county in California has one. Grand Jurys are comprised of 19 individuals of the public contributing 20 hours a week. Members must apply.

Grand Juries act as a finder of fact, determine if the entity is following the laws that govern operations of the entity. Ultimately, they are meant to satisfy the watchdog role and hold the entity accountable. Grand Jurys have the power to issue reports which, while without regulatory authority, do obligate local governmental entities to respond. These reports and their responses can be very influential by drawing attention of constituents and creating public pressure. Reports are vetted by the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court. Matters of private disputes or federal law are not subject to Grand Jury investigation.

Vice Chair Kelly asked what it would mean for the Board of Supervisors to consent to the County’s response to the Grand Jury Report. Mr. Sheng said it meant there would be no discussion, essentially indicating they would agree on the County response, whereas a regular agenda item would involve discussion or debate.

Alternate Member Salinger expressed that there are two entities involved in the Crystal Springs Regional Trail: Caltrans and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC), and that perhaps San Mateo County Parks would be a little involved. The PUC answers only to the SF mayor, they have been known to drag their feet. It took them 15 years to complete a little stretch of Crystal Springs. Alternate Salinger wondered whether the Grand Jury Report helped or added teeth in this context. Mr. Sheng responded that the Grand Jury can only operate within their jurisdictional boundaries.

Member Butcher commented that the recommendations in the Report ask the County agencies to address the gap, which would imply working with those external agencies.

Vice Chair Kelly expressed that the recommendations consist of three reports by March 31st as well as a recommendation for the agencies to collaborate, and asked if the BOS approves the Report, whether the actions be adopted by the BOS. Mr. Sheng responded that the BOS would accept them, rather than approve them.

Mr. Sheng then explained the process for providing input on the Report at the BOS meeting. At a consent meeting, it happens at the outset. In order for the letter to be part of the official record, one would submit the letter to the Clerk prior to the meeting’s start.
Ms. Malmo-Laycock agreed to send an email to the BPAC once the item was confirmed to be on the BOS agenda.

8. **Presentation on Summary of Crystal Springs Regional Trail Grand Jury Report Findings (Information)**

Ms. Malmo-Laycock delivered a presentation summarizing the findings and recommendations of the Crystal Springs Grand Jury Report.

Member Doherty and Alternate Member Salinger suggested that there were additional gaps beyond what was identified in the report, including one north of the study area, and one south of the study area. Alternate Member Salinger lamented the absence of a recommendation in the Report that called for the PUC to open up one of their roads to bicycle and pedestrians. Alternate Member Salinger asked whether it was possible to list specific recommendations during public comment at the BOS meeting, to which Mr. Sheng responded yes.

Tim O’Brien, a member of the public who attended the meeting, suggested that someone could ask for the item to be removed from the consent calendar at the BOS meeting for further discussion. Member Butcher added that if one of the Supervisors wishes to remove the item from the consent calendar, they can do so, and suggested that as a BPAC the group could support the grand jury report as is and indicate that they would like to be in the loop as things progress, kept apprised of what’s happening to move this forward.

Alternate Member Salinger expressed her desire for the letter to be worded more strongly so as to highlight the risk she perceived on the corridor. Chair Gore indicated that the discussion belonged in the next agenda item.


Vice Chair Kelly suggested that there are three things the BPAC could do: 1) Submit a letter supporting the Grand Jury Report recommendations; 2) Have one or more of the BPAC members attend the BOS meeting and provide commentary indicating that the BPAC endorses the Report but pointing out that there are other gaps in this trail; and 3) Invite someone from the County who has knowledge of these gaps to talk about why these exist, what it would take to open these things up, to the next BPAC meeting.

Alternate Member Salinger wished to ask why the PUC roads exist and why aren’t they open to the public. Member Doherty pointed out that the BPAC could meet with Supervisor Horsley about the Report and let him know there is more to it.

Vice Chair Kelly expressed that there are two discussions – is there a letter we can write, and what else can we do to push this forward? Chair Gore asked if there were changes or additions anyone wanted to see in the letter. Vice Chair added that the County had provided input on the draft letter about whether the letter should be as blunt as it is with regards to the current safety situation.

Mr. O’Brien spoke to voice his agreement with the letter and with the report, adding that as a cyclist once you get past Canada at SR-92, you must pass people on 92 going to 35, and there is no signage. In some places there are sharrows, which is at least something that pops into people’s vision. You either take the
whole lane or you take six inches. He concluded that he concurred with the letter and what the BPAC was doing, that it’s the best way forward.

Alternate Member Salinger expressed a desire for the last two sentences in the third paragraph be printed in bold, and that it might be good to add language regarding some of the spots that the Mr. O’Brien brought up during public comment that aren’t in the Grand Jury report. Chair Gore responded that the BPAC could talk about additional gaps and what the BPAC can do at its next meeting and bring in someone from the County. Alternate Member Salinger suggested the letter list the possible answers to the issues in the report, however Member Butcher was not in favor of including this in the letter and that she recommended giving County Staff the opportunity to present alternatives. Alternate Member Salinger further emphasized the need for stronger language regarding the “clear and present safety risk” in the letter, to which Vice Chair Kelly added that this was some of the language highlighted by County Counsel as undesirable. Alternate Member Salinger expressed that she was fine with leaving the language as is.

Member Doherty subsequently recommended language be added to the last paragraph to include a reference to closing the gaps.

Chair Gore requested a motion to approve the draft letter with the changes suggested by Member Salinger (bolding of selected language) and Member Doherty (addition of language regarding closing the gaps to last paragraph).

Motion: Member Doherty moved to approve/Alternate Member Salinger Seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chair Kelly and Alternate Member Salinger requested that the BPAC have someone from the County at the next meeting to talk about the gaps, and Member Doherty requested that a field trip be organized to view the area alongside County Staff. Member Butcher asked whether the BPAC could have the departments report out on the recommendation from the Crystal Springs Grand Jury Report that By September 30, 2019, the County Planning Department, the County Parks Department, the County Office of Sustainability and C/CAG should establish a means of coordinating their planning efforts related to the CSRT. Ms. Malmo-Laycock responded that she would look into these requests.

Ms. Malmo-Laycock added that she received a communication from Alternate Member Langbein, who could not make the meeting: “I do note that the presentation makes a reference to a roundabout at the intersection of Skyline/rt35 and rt92 as part of the ‘connect the coastside’. My fear is that it could be a two lane roundabout with inadequate accommodation for cyclists; this is an issue that the bpac needs to track. Please pass-on my concern to the BPAC -- which is tangential to the GJ report”

10. County Updates

Ms. Malmo-Laycock notified the BPAC that the County would be holding interviews for the BPAC vacancy, and will hopefully have identified a new member to attend the December BPAC meeting.

Ms. Malmo-Laycock also provided a brief update on the Unincorporated County Active Transportation Plan progress: the project team is working to analyze information gathered in previous outreach and existing conditions phases, and is now coming up with high level policy questions for the community which
will be the basis for the second round of outreach. Ms. Malmo-Laycock requested feedback on potential community events the County could table at.

Finally, Ms. Malmo-Laycock reminded the BPAC members of the Pedro Point Headlands Coastal Trail planning community meeting to be held on 10/10/19 from 6-8 pm at the Pacifica Community Center.

11. Adjournment

Chair Gore requested a motion to adjourn. 
*Motion: Vice Chair Kelly moved to approve/ Member Doherty seconded. The motion carried unanimously.*

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 pm.